

**BRISTOL WARREN REGIONAL
SCHOOL COMMITTEE WORKSHOP / MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 12, 2010**

The bi-monthly meeting of the Bristol Warren Regional School Committee was held on Monday, April 12, 2010, in the Cafeteria of Mt. Hope High School, 199 Chestnut Street in Bristol, RI. The Chairperson, Paul Silva, called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 PM.

Present: Paul Silva, Chair, Paul E. Brule, Vice-Chair, William M. O'Dell, Treasurer, Marjorie J. McBride, Secretary, Denise R. Arsenault, John C. Bento, Diana B. Campbell, Karen A. Lynch and John P. Saviano; Melinda L. Thies, Superintendent; Mario J. Andrade, Assistant Superintendent; Pauline A. Silva, Director of Administration and Finance; Leslie J. Anderson, Director of Pupil Personnel Services; and Mary N. Almeida, Director of Literacy and Title I

Absent: none

OPENING BUSINESS

All present were invited to join in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

PUBLIC FORUM

None

SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation #S2010-14: That the School Committee, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, adopt a resolution in opposition to the proposed funding formula that has been promulgated by the RI Department of Education.

MOTION: Mr. Brule motioned to approve. Mrs. Campbell seconded. The motion passed by a vote of 9 to 0.

Recommendation #S2010-15: That the School Committee, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, adopt a resolution in opposition to House Bill 2010 çV H7581 that mandates binding arbitration on monetary matters for school teachers and other school employees.

MOTION: Mr. Brule motioned to approve. Mrs. Campbell seconded. Because she is related to many who would be impacted by this vote, Mrs. Arsenault recused herself. Mr. Bento also recused himself from this vote. Mr. Silva commented that although he has recused himself from any Council 94 action, and respects Mr. Bento's recusal, he chooses not to recuse himself on this matter because he does not

feel it constitutes an ethics violation. Mr. Bento retracted his recusal. Mr. Saviano moved the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0 with Mrs. Arsenault recused.

Recommendation #S2010-16: That the School Committee, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, adopt a resolution in opposition to Senate Bill 2010 çV S 2603 that mandates expired teacher contracts must continue at the existing terms and conditions. **MOTION:** Mr. Brule motioned to approve. Mrs. McBride seconded. Mrs. Arsenault recused herself from this vote. Mr. Ojeda commented that it is ludicrous to have before the Committee three resolutions in opposition to legislation that has such an incredible impact on the school district. Mrs. McBride agreed, saying closer scrutiny reveals even more restrictions; she recalled Mr. William Estrella saying how disappointed he was the State would not have respect for the voters and decisions the Committee made. Mrs. Thies added this legislation would include municipal and town government which further erodes the responsibility of this Committee and Administration. Mr. Saviano said the legislature tucked the mandates in the middle of a very large supplemental bill hoping it would slide by.

Mr. Silva stated everyone who believes in these resolutions needs to contact their Senators and Representatives and it must be done tonight because the vote is slated for tomorrow. Mrs. Arsenault thanked Mrs. Thies and Mr. Saviano for providing the links; she contacted her legislators this afternoon. Mrs. Lynch reminded the

Committee that Bristol Town Councilwoman, Mary Parella, at the Joint Finance Meeting said it means a lot when a large number of people call their legislators to say, „Don't do this to us;” if the legislators do not hear from people they assume there is no opposition.

The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 0 with Mrs. Arsenault recused.

PRESENTATION: NECAP ASSESSMENT

Dr. Andrade and Mrs. Almeida presented the District's NECAP Assessment data.

Mrs. Almeida presented the Reading & Writing Assessment.

„X NECAP (New England Common Assessments Program) Grades 3-8, and Grade 11

„X Required by NCLB (ESEA Legislation) of 2002

„X 2009 is the 5th year of NECAP

„X NECAP data provides valuable information to our district & schools for identifying student needs.

„X NECAP provides data for evaluation of our curriculum, instruction, and assessments.

„X NECAP results are reported in Level of Proficiency: 4-Proficiency with Distinction, 3- Proficient, 2-Partially Proficient, and 1-Substantially Below Proficient

NECAP Reading Proficiency District & State Comparison for Grades 3-8

Year BW Percent

Proficient State Percent Proficient

2009 79% 70%

2008 80% 68%

2007 77% 65%

2006 72% 62%

2005 67% 59%

NECAP Reading Proficiency Testing Year Beginning 3rd Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 22% 58% 80% 13% 7%

2008 27% 52% 79% 11% 10%

2007 14% 65% 79% 11% 10%

2006 20% 59% 79% 16% 6%

2005 17% 53% 70% 21% 9%

NECAP Reading Proficiency Longitudinal Grade 3

2005-2009 Reading Proficiency by School ꝑV Grade 3 ꝑV Testing Year

2009-2010 Content By Strand Percent Correct ꝑV Grade 3 Reading

NECAP Reading Proficiency iV Testing Year Beginning 4th Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 26% 48% 74% 14% 12%

2008 29% 49% 78% 15% 7%

2007 26% 54% 80% 14% 7%

2006 21% 52% 73% 20% 7%

2005 21% 48% 69% 22% 10%

NECAP Reading Proficiency Longitudinal Data Grade 4

2005-2009 Reading Proficiency By School ꞑV Grade 4 ꞑV Testing Year

2009-2010 Content By Strand Percent Correct ÿV Grade 4 Reading

NECAP Reading Proficiency iV Testing Year Beginning 5th Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 26% 56% 82% 12% 6%

2008 20% 61% 81% 12% 7%

2007 23% 49% 72% 19% 9%

2006 21% 51% 72% 20% 8%

2005 17% 51% 68% 22% 10%

NECAP Reading Proficiency Longitudinal Data Grade 5

2005-2009 Reading Proficiency By School ꞑV Grade 5 ꞑV Testing Year

2009-2010 Content By Strand Percent Correct ꞑV Grade 5 Reading

NECAP Reading Proficiency iV Testing Year Beginning 6th Grade

Year	4	3	Total	2	1
2009	22%	59%	81%	12%	8%
2008	19%	64%	83%	14%	4%
2007	20%	56%	76%	16%	7%
2006	15%	57%	72%	22%	7%
2005	10%	56%	66%	26%	7%

NECAP Reading Longitudinal Proficiency Grade 6

NECAP Reading Proficiency iV Testing Year Beginning 7th Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 16% 61% 77% 17% 5%

2008 25% 58% 83% 15% 2%

2007 20% 59% 79% 17% 4%

2006 14% 59% 73% 21% 6%

2005 6% 60% 66% 22% 13%

NECAP Reading Longitudinal Proficiency Grade 7

NECAP Reading Proficiency iV Testing Year Beginning 8th Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 20% 58% 78% 20% 2%

2008 16% 60% 76% 18% 6%

2007 19% 58% 77% 20% 4%

2006 13% 54% 67% 21% 12%

2005 8% 55% 63% 29% 8%

NECAP Reading Longitudinal Proficiency Grade 8

2009 NECAP Grade 6-8 Reading Percent Correct by Strand

District Results ꝀV By Cohort ꝀV Reading

Year (Goal)

Grade 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2013

3 70 79 79 79 80

4 69 73 80 78 74

5 68 72 72 81 82

6 66 72 76 83 81

7 66 73 79 83 77

8 63 67 77 76 78

9

10

11 78 87 84

NECAP Reading Proficiency District & State Comparison for Grade 11

Year BW Percent

Proficient State Percent Proficient

2009 84% 73%

2008 87% 69%

2007 78% 61%

NECAP Reading Proficiency iV Testing Year Beginning 11th Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 42% 42% 84% 9% 6%

2008 37% 50% 87% 8% 5%

2007 27% 51% 78% 16% 7%

NECAP Reading Longitudinal Proficiency Grade 11

NECAP Reading Content by Strand Percent Correct iV Grade 11

Grade 3 ÷V 11 Reading Testing Year

BWRSC Literacy Action Plan

„X Continue to further align our curriculum, instruction, and assessments

„X Continue to monitor the implementation of our Standards-Based K-8 ELA Curriculum

„X Continue to develop „Professional Learning Community” with a focus on data-driven instruction to look at student work through formative assessments.

„X Promote collaborative co-teaching models of instruction to benefit all students in categorical programs (Title I, Literacy, IEP and ESL students).

„X Implementation of district wide K-8 literacy lab classrooms to demonstrate the workshop model, differentiation of instruction & best practice.

„X Provided embedded PD for teachers in the areas of guided reading, comprehension, and writing constructed responses.

„X Continue to use research-based reading and writing programs (SIPPS, Making Meaning, and Being a Writer)

„X Provide additional training in Assessments (MClass, and MClass 3-D) on benchmarking, monitoring student progress, and targeted intervention strategies.

„X Use MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) 4th-9th grade testing data to target student needs in reading and language arts.

„X Provide PD in RTI (Response to Intervention) for classroom teachers and support staff K-12. Training in RTI to be planned collaboratively to accelerate learning for all students.

„X Continue to support and train teachers in implementing Personal Literacy Plans for students at the elementary, middle, and high school level.

„X Work with principals and teacher leaders to address the literacy needs of all students in the content areas of science, social studies,

and math (4-12 grade).

„X Continue providing Summer Literacy and Numeracy Program for students with academic needs.

„X Continue to collaborate with RWU, East Bay Senior Center, Mosaico, and KEF to develop community partnerships that support student learning and district literacy and numeracy initiatives.

„X Increase Parental Involvement, along with providing workshops on literacy through RIPIN (RI Parent Information Network).

2009 Mathematics NECAP Data Analysis ¡V Presented by Dr. Mario Andrade

NECAP Math Proficiency District & State Comparison for Grades 3 ¡V 8

Year BW Percent

Proficient State Percent Proficient

2009 71% 59%

2008 71% 57%

2007 67% 54%

2006 65% 53%

2005 60% 50%

NECAP Writing Longitudinal Proficiency Grade 11

NECAP Writing Proficiency Testing Year iV Beginning 11th Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 15% 63% 78% 18% 3%

2008 4% 45% 50% 45% 6%

2007 4% 54% 58% 36% 6%

NECAP Writing Proficiency District & State Comparison for Grade 11

Year BW Percent

Proficient State Percent Proficient

2009 78% 55%

2008 50% 42%

2007 58% 37%

NECAP Math Proficiency iV Testing Year Beginning 3rd Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 24% 49% 73% 15% 12%

2008 27% 48% 75% 15% 9%

2007 30% 48% 78% 11% 10%

2006 33% 42% 75% 17% 8%

2005 26% 44% 70% 15% 14%

NECAP Math Longitudinal Proficiency Grade 3

Content by Strand Percent Correct ÿV Grade 3

2005-2009 Mathematics Proficiency by School ÷ Grade 3 ÷ Testing Year

NECAP Math Proficiency ÷ Testing Year Beginning 4th Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 24% 52% 76% 14% 10%

2008 29% 46% 75% 15% 10%

2007 17% 55% 72% 17% 11%

2006 14% 54% 68% 21% 11%

2005 19% 43% 62% 23% 15%

NECAP Math Longitudinal Proficiency Grade 4

Content by Strand Percent Correct ÿV Grade 4

2005-2009 Mathematics Proficiency by School ÷ Grade 4 ÷ Testing Year

NECAP Math Proficiency ÷ Testing Year Beginning 5th Grade
Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009	30%	45%	75%	13%	12%
2008	24%	51%	75%	12%	14%
2007	17%	49%	66%	19%	16%
2006	18%	48%	66%	21%	12%
2005	22%	41%	63%	20%	18%

NECAP Math Longitudinal Proficiency Grade 5

Content by Strand Percent Correct \bar{V} Grade 5

**2005-2009 Mathematics Proficiency by School ÷ Grade 5 ÷ Testing
Year**

NECAP Math Proficiency iV Testing Year Beginning 6th Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 29% 46% 75% 12% 14%

2008 21% 46% 67% 18% 15%

2007 21% 47% 68% 21% 12%

2006 23% 42% 65% 17% 18%

2005 14% 48% 62% 20% 18%

NECAP Math Longitudinal Proficiency Grade 6

Content by Strand Percent Correct ÷V Grade 6

NECAP Math Proficiency iV Testing Year Beginning 7th Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 23% 38% 61% 21% 18%

2008 22% 47% 69% 13% 19%

2007 20% 40% 60% 23% 17%

2006 20% 41% 61% 20% 19%

2005 10% 37% 47% 24% 29%

NECAP Math Longitudinal Proficiency Grade 7

Content by Strand Percent Correct \pm Grade 7

NECAP Math Proficiency iV Testing Year Beginning 8th Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 19% 46% 65% 19% 16%

2008 17% 47% 64% 17% 19%

2007 16% 44% 60% 25% 16%

2006 15% 37% 52% 19% 29%

2005 11% 46% 57% 21% 23%

NECAP Math Longitudinal Proficiency iV Grade 8

Content by Strand Percent Correct jV Grade 8

MECAP Math Proficiency iV Testing Year Beginning 11th Grade

Year 4 3 Total 2 1

2009 19% 46% 65% 19% 16%

2008 17% 47% 64% 17% 19%

2007 16% 44% 60% 25% 16%

2006 15% 37% 52% 19% 29%

2005 11% 46% 57% 21% 23%

NECAP Math Longitudinal Proficiency Grade 11

Content by Strand Percent Correct ¶V Grade 11

Year BW Percent

Proficient State Percent Proficient

2009 32% 28%

2008 40% 27%

2007 29% 22%

Grade 3 ÷ V 11 Math Testing Year

BW Mathematics Action Plan

„X Provide Interventions for IEP students

„İ Co-teaching teams

„İ Provide Math PD

„İ Implement intervention program K-2

„X Align Math Curriculum K-10 to GLE's/GSE's

„X Implement formative assessment system

„İ Completed ıV NWEA MAP assessment 4-9

„X Implement more rigorous curriculum at middle level

„İ Impact Mathematics

„İ Mini-Math Forum: 4 Intensive Workshops

„X Provide more time for math instruction

„İ Numeracy block at middle level

„X Continue ramp-up and enrichment programs

„İ Extended-day Math support programs

„« Elementary Math ramp-up

„« Middle School Math ramp-up and Saturday Academy

„« High School extended-day Math support and MASH programs

„X Development of Common Interim Assessments

„İ Embedding common benchmark problems in Everyday Math unit

assessments

„İ Development of common assessments at middle and high school level

„X Alignment of middle level common tasks to PBGRİ's

„X Mount Hope High School Math Intervention Pathway

„X K-2 Math AddVantage

„X Elementary CPT Math Goals

Math Intervention & Progress Monitoring

Grade Tested Increase

1 26 21

2 31 29

3 22 22

4 5 5

5 2 2

Math Released Items Summary Data Via Interactive Tool for Grade 11

Mr. Saviano asked Mrs. Almeida why Hugh Cole scored lower in some areas than the other schools and if a plan has been formulated to raise their scores. Mrs. Almeida explained that Hugh Cole is a Title I school with a 40% poverty rate and a "school wide" program will be instituted and reform strategies are being explored.

Mrs. Thies commented there has been tremendous growth at Colt Andrews and Guiteras their approach of knowing each individual student and his strengths and weaknesses can be replicated at all the schools. Mrs. Campbell asked if teacher bumping hinders progress. Mrs. Thies said that is at a minimum in this District, it is more a system approach that works. Mr. Saviano asked if there is a

correlation between low scores in the early grades and the dropout rate; are the dropouts tracked back to a specific elementary school. Mrs. Almeida said not all students come into school at the same reading level, no matter what the school but the effort is made to get all students at their appropriate reading levels.

Mrs. Lynch expressed concerns about teachers not being able to teach children because of the amount of testing they must do. Mrs. Almeida said students are tested for benchmarks three times per year. Mrs. McBride acknowledged the successes in writing and reading but is concerned by the 6% of 11th graders who are substantially below proficient in reading; she would never want to see more than 0%.

Regarding the 78% proficiency scores at 11th grade in writing, a 24%age point increase in two years, Dr. Andrade said this puts us third in the State behind Classical and East Greenwich High Schools and is attributable to high school administration and most notably Mr. Patrick Jackson. Also, high school administration also interviewed all their students focusing on those students who scored 4 in reading and 1 in math. The dip in the scores at the middle level is being addressed with a team approach; teachers are talking at grade level so curriculum alignment with assessment must be reviewed.

Mr. Saviano asked if there was a higher percentage of IEP students at Hugh Cole than the other elementary schools; Mrs. Almeida

confirmed there is partly because we include Pre-K special needs students and there are many new students at Hugh Cole; Mrs. Almeida will supply Mr. Saviano with these numbers.

Mrs. Campbell said parents would love to help but some parents need coaching. Dr. Andrade said we are building a sense of community. Mr. Saviano questioned the value of Chicago Math saying many parents have complained about it; Mrs. Thies said Chicago Math is conducive to high student assessment. Mrs. Campbell mentioned that at a RIASC meeting a lady from Maryland said this kind of tool was prohibitive to achievement.

RFP for Review of Enabling Legislation

Mr. Silva postponed this discussion to the next workshop.

BUDGET FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. O'Dell announced the location of their next two meetings will be the Mt. Hope High School Library Classroom, the next meeting being April 19, 6:30 PM.

POLICY/ COMMUNITY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mrs. Campbell reported a few Superintendent's recommendations will be on the next School Committee Meeting agenda for some slight

policy adjustments. Mrs. Campbell then made the following statement regarding the Chemical Health Policy:

“Our goal is to assert the position of the School Committee on the use of tobacco, alcohol and other drugs (TAOD) at school events and non-school events. We care about our children at the middle and high school levels and though this policy is not complete in time for the season of celebrations: prom, confirmations, awards banquets, etc., we want to make clear that we are concerned with the well being of our students and hope that they will make wise choices in the course of their celebrations. These celebrations are gateways from childhood to adulthood. We want you to make it through the gateways safely and without regrets.

Part of being an adult is being able to see beyond today to the future and to make choices today that put you in a better position to be the best adult you can be in the future. We want you to have fun to celebrate but we encourage you to make wise choices and to be safe.”

PERSONNEL/ CONTRACT NEGOTIATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Saviano said there is nothing remarkable going on; they are working on an item that will hopefully be good news.

FUTURE ENROLLMENT AND FACILITIES TASK FORCE

Mrs. Lynch said the group will be making their presentation to the

Bristol and Warren Town Councils this Thursday, April 15, at 7:00 PM in the Mt. Hope High School Cafeteria. Everyone is welcome. There will be a question and answer session at the end. The goal is to secure a vote to amend the enabling legislation. Mr. Silva informed the public they can come to the presentation and get some answers; there seem to be misconceptions. Mrs. Lynch said they made both long term and short term recommendations for consideration; a new school building or an addition are long term recommendations that may not have to ever be considered. The Committee's focus is to be proactive instead of reactive.

Mr. Saviano reminded everyone to contact their legislators.

Mr. Silva said there is no need for an Executive Session and reiterated Mr. Saviano's plea to contact legislators.

ADJOURNMENT V 9:17 PM

MOTION: There being no further business to discuss, Mr. Brule, seconded by Mrs. McBride, motioned to adjourn at 9:17 PM. The motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Marjorie J. McBride, Secretary

/c